The United Nations, Global Cyberspace, and the Route to Hegemony

INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS: GLOBAL POLITICAL ECONOMY

MASTER THESIS

Irene Johanna van Os

i.j.van.os@umail.leidenuniv.nl

s1707345

Wordcount: 14765

5th of July 2019

Thesis supervisor: Saori Shibata

Leiden University

Page of Content

Chapter 1: Introduction

Over the past decades, cyberspace has become a significant part of everyday life. The emergence of the Internet has transformed communication and information processes, and it has also increased interconnectedness on a worldwide scale. In the contemporary world, daily life is almost entirely dependent on Internet systems, which make our lives more convenient in the sense that it is now possible to utilise a laptop or mobile phone to check a bank balance, the weather forecast, train arrival times, or social platforms. While the technologies used in digital devices have resulted in many positive developments and have become increasingly integrated into our lifestyles, the Internet also has a darker side. Cyber threats are continuously increasing, and the reality of a cyber war is on the horizon. For instance, there have been continuous reports in the media on how the databases of governmental institutions, corporations, banks, and healthcare services have been breached, regardless of their security measures. Cyber threats are complex, multidimensional, and capable of affecting entire societal structures. Amongst others, Internet threats include forms of cybercrime such as hacking, cyber espionage, cyber activism, cyber terrorism, and cyber warfare with the purpose of wronging others.

While these are relatively new types of crime, the increasing global dependence of states, governmental institutions, international organisations, corporations, and individuals on Internet systems makes the consequences of these threats more impactful, serious, and far-reaching. According to a survey by the Internet security company Norton, 'more than 987 million people in 20 countries were affected by cybercrime in 2017' (2017 p. 4). In the 2013 report of another Internet security company, Kaspersky, it is mentioned that '31.45% of all phishing attacks [which involve the theft of user data] in 2013 targeted financial institutions' (Lab Report 2014 p. 5). Moreover, in the 2007 cyber-attack on Estonia, the whole country was disrupted after Russian Internet Hackers shut down its digital-based public transport and banking systems. Since this attack, countries have implemented policies to strengthen their cyber capacities and improve their knowledge of cyberspace and related skills. In 2010, NATO recognised cyberwarfare as 'one of the most serious threats to the alliance and its member states' (Heickerö 2012 p. 9).

There are numerous examples which highlight the problematic results of cyber threats for state and non-state actors. For this reason, cyberspace, especially the global regulation and security of cyberspace to prevent cybercrime, has become a major part of the international

political agenda. As Butler and Lachow (2012 p. 1) described, 'Effective cyber security requires that national governments, private companies, and non-governmental organisations work together to understand threats in cyberspace and to share information and capabilities mitigating those threats. Thus, in order to prevent global cyber threats, a multilateral framework and the establishment of coordinated action amongst states, but as well as corporations and civil society, could be beneficial. For instance, some form of global cyber governance could regulate, manage, and adhere to international law for states and non-state actors in cases of cybercrime, eventually leading to a safer and more secure Internet.

Currently, the UN-mandated cyber initiative the United Groups of Governmental Experts on the Developments in the Field of Information and Telecommunications in the Context of International Security (UN GGEs) is one of the most prominent mechanism aiming to establish a global multilateral framework in cyberspace and cybersecurity. There have been multiple UN GGEs which consist of state officials, experts in the field of cybersecurity, and representatives of cyber organisations. However, some have argued that, so far, the results of the UN GGEs have remained limited (Iasiello 2016; Choucri, Madnick, and Ferwerda 2014), which is alarming but perhaps not that surprising, as United Nations (UN) multilateral initiatives and the UN GGEs have been severely criticised in academic debate (Keohane 1990; Krause 2004; van der Meer 2015; Meyer 2013; Tikk-Ringas 2016; Kane 2014; Henriksen 2019). Even the UN secretary-general openly questioned the capacity of the UN organisation to deal with future multilateral challenges, such as cyberspace (Bersick et al. 2006 p. 13). Moreover, some scholars have argued that UN multilateralism is influenced by states and multinational corporations, which might steer initiatives according to state or corporate interests instead of the greater global good (Swift 1958; Kuziemko, and Werker 2006; Carter and Stone 2015; Woo and Chung 2018; Brazys and Panke 2017; Fritsch 2008; Berliner and Prakash 2014; Jenks 2014; Utting and Zammit 2009; Park and Jun 2016).

Regarding the intensity of cyber threats and the current need for cyber governance, it is essential that global action be undertaken for the benefit of the greater good, instead of state or corporate interests. Nonetheless, there is limited research on the extent to which states and multinational corporations influence UN multilateral initiatives, in particular in cyberspace, which is a significant subject regarding the modern-day global policy agenda. In addition, most of the research in this field is concerned with theorising relations of influence from states and multinational corporations in UN multilateralism based on liberal, realist and constructivist approaches. As an alternative approach, this paper proposes a neo-Gramscian

analysis of the influence of states and corporations on UN multilateralism. In terms of global cyber governance initiatives, studies have indicated that neo-Gramscian theory is relevant, but few researchers have focussed on the UN GGEs. For this reason, this thesis takes a neo-Gramscian approach to analyse the influence of states and multinational corporations on the UN GGEs. This paper proposes that neo-Gramscian theory is relevant in examining relations of influence and the UN GGEs, which is considered a suitable and innovative approach according to the existing literature on this topic. In short, neo-Gramscian theory is a critical International Relations (IR) theory that explores the relationship between a specific dominant or elite class and the process of integrating their ideas in institutions and agendas to create and maintain their power and further their hegemonic interests to change the global order. In accordance with this theory, a dominant class consisting of both state and corporate actors would be capable of steering and influencing the UN multilateral initiatives—and therefore the UN GGEs—in the interests of the dominant class, which are not necessarily in line with the interests of the public good (i.e. ensuring a safe global cyberspace).

With the intention of studying the subject in the most feasible way, two research hypotheses were formulated and evaluated in accordance with neo-Gramscian theory. Hypothesis 1 holds that states and multinational corporations are significant actors that steer and exercise influence on the UN political system according to their own interests. Subsequently, hypothesis 2 of this research is that the UN GGEs might represent the interests and hegemonic ambitions of elites in states and multinational corporations over civil society interests. To asses these hypotheses, the following guiding research question was created for this paper: How do states and multinational corporations influence the UN multilateral cyber initiative known as the UN GGEs according to neo-Gramscian theory?

In order to answer this research question, UN GGE reports were examined through the qualitative research method of document analysis (Bryman 2012 p. 549- 563). Document analysis provided insights that allowed to apply neo- Gramscian theory to textual material. The reports are the closest connected documents to the work of the UN GGEs, as the groups are relatively discrete, and they are the only publicly available sources with information about the activities of the UN GGEs in particular years. To my knowledge, these reports have not been examined through neo-Gramscian theory and document analysis so far.

With all this in mind, this thesis is organised as follows. Firstly, a literature review is provided to present what has already been said on the topics of UN multilateralism and global cyber governance in the existing academic literature. These sections also highlight the relevant

literature on the influence of states and corporations on UN multilateralism, the multistakeholder approach to global cyber governance, and the UN GGEs. More importantly, the literature review constitutes an attempt to demonstrate the feasibility of neo- Gramscian theory in studying these subjects. Secondly, the components of the utilised theoretical framework of this research, neo-Gramscian theory, are discussed more extensively in the theory section. Then, the paper moves to the document analysis of the UN GGEs based on reports published in 2010, 2013, and 2015 through a neo-Gramscian lens. The research closes with a conclusion and recommendations for further research.

Chapter 2: Literature review

UN Multilateralism *and the influence of states and corporations*

First and foremost, there exists no concrete academic linkage between UN multilateralism, the influence of states and corporations, global cyber governance, the UN GGEs, and neo-Gramscian theory. Even though there has been much research on these individual subjects, few researchers have taken neo-Gramscian perspective into consideration. This perspective is of relevance, as it can provide an additional perception to the influence of states and corporations on the UN GGEs in establishing a multilateral framework in cyberspace to reduce and diminish cyber threats.

The literature review concentrates on two themes for the purpose of this research: UN multilateralism and global cyber governance. In the first section, the review focusses on the argumentation in the existing literature about UN multilateralism which will be related to the influence of states and corporations on UN multilateral initiatives. Thereafter, the review covers the scholarly debate on global cyber governance and the UN GGEs. Throughout the review, it is aimed to demonstrate the relevance of neo-Gramscian theory in analysing the UN GGEs.

2.1 UN Multilateralism

How UN multilateral initiatives are influenced by states and multinational corporations is one of the central topics of this research. Therefore, the following section points to what has been said about the influence of states and corporations on the UN in the existing academic literature. Moreover, it also presents the problematics of the literature and how neo-Gramscian theory could be valuable as an additional perspective. While multilateralism might be conceived of as a means to restrain the exercise of hegemonic power (Lake 2002), this review challenges this claim and aims to link the agenda of UN multilateral initiatives to the influence and steering of states and corporations. To provide some background for the reader, this section begins with a more in-depth elaboration on what multilateralism in relation to the UN entails. In this research, *UN multilateralism* and *UN multilateral initiatives* refers to multilateral actions taken by the UN for the conduct of global policy for a range of states, but also non- state actors involved in the UN.

There is a wide-ranging literature on the definition and meaning of multilateralism, but the aim here is not to take part in that discussion; instead, the focus is on the meaning which covers the diversity of actors involved in global politics. In the academic literature, multilateralism generally refers to international cooperation amongst more than two states, which can be defined as a form of governance intended to resolve global problems in international politics (Krause 2004; Ruggie 1992; Keohane 1990). Since the end of the Second World War, multilateralism has become an increasingly important component of international politics (Keohane 1990). Today, multilateral practices guide world politics, and these practices can be drawn from many multilateral negotiations, conferences, representatives, and organisations. In addition to the conventional state-centric approach, there is the importance of the multiplicity of actors, both state and non-state, in contemporary world politics, such as international institutions, multinational corporations, social groups, NGOs, and civil society involved in multilateral practices and global governance. Along these lines, studies refer to 'market multilateralism' or 'new multilateralism' (Bhanji 2008 p. 55; Ulfgard and Jaime 2014 p. 1529), which involves the engagement of transnational corporations and civil society in modern global governance.

Studies have critically examined the effectiveness and meaning of UN multilateralism (Keohane 1990; Krause 2004). In relation to multilateralism, Keohane described the UN as an open institution, making it likely to be limited principally to symbolic issues and operations (1990 p. 753), which could lead people to question the effectiveness of the institution. In the case of the UN, this symbolic issues and operations were especially focused on maintaining international peace and security through international cooperation. On the subject of the effectiveness of the UN, Krause argued more directly, asserting that the main cause of crisis in international politics has been the failure of the UN to manage the conflicts and threats that have emerged the past decades, such as climate change (2004 p. 43). In particular, he identified the misconduct of the 'collective security' multilateral approach of the UN, which entails states giving up some degree of national sovereignty in order to ensure the safety of member states by, for instance, mediation or military intervention (2004 p. 44). What is controversial in Krause's claim is that, on the one hand, the argument seems to blame the UN system for crises while, on the other hand, also implicating states in multilateral misconduct. In other words, the effectiveness of UN multilateralism depends both on the UN and states. While the diversity of actors is at the heart of multilateralism, other actors of influence such as

corporations or civil society tend to be overlooked by these studies, which are evidently important in modern day global politics.

Another strand of literature focusses on the insights of International Relations (IR) theory, which aims to explain the international political system, in understanding relations of influence in UN multilateralism. In particular, liberal and realist theories have been used to understand power dynamics and influence in the UN system. For instance, liberal studies (Slaughter 1994; Paris 1997) underline the importance of international organisations and their promotion of liberal values, such as democracy, individual liberty, and the rule of law, in the international system. In relation to the UN, Slaughter (1994 p. 401) underscored the function of the UN as an organisation that forms state preferences, and its success depends more on the degree to which it impacts states than how it constrains them. According to liberalists, the UN organization is of fundamental importance in the international system. Yet, what is problematic in the liberal account is that it seems to perceive the UN as a sole entity in the international system, disregarding other actors, ideologies, interests, ideas and material power, which is a rather abstract approach. Also, it does not clearly provide an answer to how actors rather than values influence the UN system.

By way of contrast, realist studies (Claude 1959; Kahler 1992; Barnett 1997) highlight the role and importance of states in UN multilateralism. In fact, it is highlighted that the UN does not have a function of its own but should be perceived as a 'statecraft tool' for states to use to interact and struggle for power (Claude 1959 p. 46). Although this focus is relatively narrow as it mainly focuses on states, it does provide a more legitimate basis than the liberal account because it recognises the impact of states and state behaviour in the UN, which is in line with Hypothesis 1 of this thesis next to the influence of corporations.

Still, it is problematic that both liberal and realist accounts seem to leave out the influence of corporations and other actors, such as NGO's in their accounts. Moreover, their explanations tend to be universalist, abstract and ahistorical. Even more, both schools appear to leave out the importance of ideas, beliefs, ideologies and material power in studying UN multilateralism and multilateral initiative. Therefore, neo-Gramscian theory could be a useful additional perspective to study UN multilateralism with regard to the limits of both liberalism and realism, because the theory covers multiple actors and interests, but also the role of norms, ideas, and material power, which are relevant in studying power dynamics, influence and the multiplicity of actors involved in contemporary multilateral world politics.

2.1.1 The influence of states on the UN

What ties UN multilateralism to this thesis is the extent of influence of other actors, in particular states and corporations. *Influence* in this context can be best described as the power to adjust other actors' behaviour to achieve a desired decision-making result. As mentioned earlier, as a starting point realist literature highlights the importance of states in UN multilateralism, but this section will attempt to focus on then what state is influencing and how is it influencing the UN. Although there is limited literature on this subject, most studies focussing on the influence of states on the UN highlight the role of the United States. In particular, the majority of recent studies emphasise the influence of the US through the 'democratic' mechanisms of voting patterns in the UN General Assembly (Swift 1958; Kuziemko, and Werker 2006; Carter and Stone 2015; Woo and Chung 2018; Brazys and Panke 2017; Xun and Shuai 2018). Although the focus of these studies is solely on the UN General Assembly, they present insight in power dynamics amongst member states of the UN and their influence on the outcome of UN voting patterns.

The overall argument in these studies is that democratic countries would more likely adhere to US influence than non-democratic countries in voting activities and influencing the UN. In other words, it is argued that the US seeks to influence the vote totals on important UN votes, especially the voting behaviour of democracies (Carter and Stone 2015 p. 2). What is perceived, is that the US faces incentives to increase foreign aid to those countries that have differing interests and equivalent resources, a strategy since the Cold War (Woo and Chung 2018 p. 1004. Yet, Carter and Stone observed that democratic countries are in fact more strongly opposed to US policy than non-democratic countries, therefore norms or a community of interests do not clarify their voting behaviour (2015 p. 3). Even more, Brazys and Panke (2017 p. 71) argued that states with inadequate capacity—often poor and small states—have a difficult time developing their own voting standpoints about the UN agenda and therefore choose to abstain from voting, but the study does not per se point out that the choice to abstain is influenced by the US behind the scenes.

What is evident, is that the literature on this topic heavily emphasises the attempts of the US to influence other countries in voting patterns but does not focus on *how* the states are influencing the patterns for a specific outcome, for example standpoints, funding's or items on the agenda, which are in the interest of this research. Alternatively stated, the studies underline the influence of the US in UN multilateralism, but do not specify in what the US wishes to achieve for what purpose, which is interesting to take into consideration when

examining the influence of states on the UN. Moreover, similar the literature on UN multilateralism, most studies do not take into consideration other actors, such as non-state actors, which could also influence both states' and UN decision-making processes. Although the influence of states on the UN debate concentrates on US behaviour, the next section sheds light on the other component of this research, the influence of corporations.

2.2.2 The influence of corporations on the UN

Previous studies on the influence of multinational corporations on the UN system have almost exclusively focused on UN–business partnerships, in particular, the UN Global Compact initiative. What most studies indicate is that there has been an increasing engagement by the UN in business partnerships (Fritsch 2008; Berliner and Prakash 2014; Jenks 2014; Utting and Zammit 2009; Park and Jun 2016). While the literature is relatively fragmented and mentions private sector engagement in specific UN initiatives such as the development goals (Park and Jun 2016) and UNICEF (Jenks 2014), almost all studies perceive the UN Global Compact as the ultimate example of UN- business partnerships, and thus the influence of corporations on the UN. The UN Global Compact is an arrangement initiated by the UN to encourage businesses worldwide to implement sustainable and socially responsible measures. More specifically, the UN Global Compact adheres to principles in the area of human rights, labour, and the environment. Under the UN Global Compact, and corporations are associated with UN agencies.

Scholars have applied IR theories to analyse the development of UN–business partnerships, especially the UN Global Compact. One theory considered to be the most relevant by the literature is the rational choice perspective (Berliner and Prakash 2014; Park and Jun 2016). The rational choice perspective, which is central to the realist legacy in comprehending international politics, holds that leaders and policymakers are not affected in their decision-making by ideologies or ideas of how the world order should or might be. However, as perceived before in realist literature on UN multilateralism, this is a narrow and problematic perception of the UN–business initiative, as is does not consider the influence of ideas, ideologies, worldviews, or material power which are in fact relevant in global regimes.

Besides, few studies also propose constructivist and neo-Gramscian theories for the examination of the UN Global Compact (Park and Jun 2016; Utting 2000; Schaferhoff 2009). In contrast to the rational choice theory, constructivist argumentation underscores the

importance of, amongst other ideas, the fact that the development of UN–business partnerships is not simply a rational response. Rather, the preference for certain values and forms of governance is stressed. Constructivists highlight the normative structure that shape actors' identities and interests (Park and Jun 2016; Schaferhoff 2009), but do not consider material interests and power dynamics to be relevant.

What the neo-Gramscian perspective argues is that UN–business partnerships are a political tactic through which businesses attempt to protect corporate hegemony (Park and Jun 2016 p. 44). Moreover, the perspective considers the inclusion and exclusion of actors, suggesting complex power structures and political inequalities in UN-business partnerships (Park and Jun 2015 p. 45). As neo Gramscian theory tends to recognise the power of ideas and ideologies, but also looks beyond them and relates them to material interest and hegemony, the theory seems to be more multidimensional than rational choice or constructivist perspective. As the engagement with the UN and business is established, the literature review will move to the other theme of this review, global cyber governance.

2.2 Global Cyber Governance and the UN GGEs

'If cyberspace were a country, it would be the largest and most populated in the world, albeit one without any constitutions or government.' – Anja Mihr 2014

This section of the literature review relates the discussion of the UN multilateralism, the influence of states and corporations, and neo-Gramscian theory to cyberspace. In particular, to global cyber governance and the UN GGEs. The review first establishes the academic relevance of cyber threats. Thereafter, global cyber governance and norm-building are covered, which are essential for the examination of the UN GGEs, as these arrangements attempt to establish a form of global cyber governance by means of norm-building. Then, the review examines what has been specifically mentioned in academic debate about the UN GGE initiative.

2.2.1 The relevance of cyber threats

First, it is necessary to elaborate more on the global cyber threats and the risks of cyber conflict to underline the need of cyber governance and regulation. The purpose of this first section is to familiarise the reader with the urgency of cyberconflict but also the insightfulness of the neo-Gramscian approach to the further development of cybersecurity measures. Recent cybersecurity studies recognise the risks and threats of cyberspace as a global threat (Laing 2017; Chandrakanth 2015; Kosenkov 2016). A consensus exists that cybercrime has worldwide consequences and will great cost a great deal (Chandrakanth 2016 p.1). In more detail, Laing (2017) pointed out six key threats of cyberspace: the increasing importance of the Internet, the rise of connected devices, the growing number of vulnerabilities, the rise of malware, the lack of skilled security professionals, and the increase in the number and scope of data breaches. For these reasons, Lain argued, there is little choice but to organise technological solutions (2017 p. 12). Also, as Kosenkov (2016 p. 2) acknowledged, current approaches to cyber conflict are insufficient and have not yet produced significant results. Because diving into the 'current' approaches requires an in-depth technical insight into the Information and Communication Technology (ICT) field, which considers the technology behind all computer systems, the literature review here does not focus on this but rather on the ways the problematics of cyberspace are dealt with in global politics and cyber governance.

.

2.2.2 The multistakeholder approach and norm-building

The following section presents a review of recent literature on global cyber governance and norm-building in cyberspace. For the purpose of studying the UN GGEs, it is fundamental to present the debate on these topics, as it signifies the links between current global cyber governance approaches and the activities of the UN GGEs. Roughly, the debate in the literature centres on *who* should govern cyberspace and *how* it should be governed. One strand of cybersecurity literature focusses on global cyber governance and cyber norm-building. In the literature, *global cyber governance* refers to the idea of the regulation of cyberspace in accordance with a set of internationally known common norms, rules, behaviour, and law in cyberspace. The advantage of such a framework is that it provides an understanding of legitimate and illegitimate activities in cyberspace for all actors involved, such as states, corporations, and individuals. *Cyber norm-building* refers to the process of establishing common principles for the multiplicity of actors involved in cyberspace.

Most relevant studies highlight the so-called *multistakeholder approach* regarding who should be involved in global cyber governance (Mihr 2014; Shackleford et al. 2015; Jayawardane, Larik, and Jackson 2015; Carr 2015). The multistakeholder approach holds that cyberspace should be governed and regulated by many actors, including representatives of national and international governments, corporations, as well as social groups, NGOs, and individuals. The idea behind this approach is the inclusion of a majority of actors to ensure the participation and accountability of all Internet users. In a way, it can be associated with a modern-day multilateral approach in international politics, as it considers coordinated action among multiple actors, state and non-state. Although this form of global cyber governance sounds promising, it has faced challenges, which are also drawn upon in academic debate.

The study of Jajawardane, Larik, and Jackson pointed out some key challenges to multistakeholder governance, including are the 'lack of transparency, unequal representation of stakeholders, and the varying degrees of influence that stakeholders wield in shaping public policy' (2015 p. 7). From a neo-Gramscian perspective, this is not surprising, as there is likelihood of a strong, dominant class with hegemon ambitions which wishes to gain and preserve power by eliminating other interests and powers in cyberspace. Yet, the study of Jajawardane, Larik, and Jackson ascribed the reason for the challenges to the differing capabilities of stakeholders coming from developed and developing countries in terms of participating efficiently in the cyber governance regime (Jajwardane, Larik and Jackson 2015 p. 7).

What is striking, is that most studies in the literature attribute these key challenges to the variety of state interests and take on a rather realist, state-centric perspective (Fliegauf 2016; Tikk-Ringas 2016; Mazanec 2016; Iasiello 2016). According to Fliegauf (2016 p. 79), states encounter an incentive issue, meaning that states prioritise their national interest over the collective in terms of establishing cyber norms. Tikk-Ringas (2016) even argued that states aspire to shape normative behaviour in the context of cybersecurity and technological developments. Along similar lines, studies relate problematic state behaviour to the (un)successfulness of the establishment of international cyber norms (Mazanec 2016; Iasiello 2016). In line with Mazanec's argument, particularly in the field of cyberwarfare, norms may not ever be reached primarily because powerful state actors are not likely to observe a consolidation between a norm and their self-interest (2016 p. 107). Moreover, Iasiello argued that cyber norms, even if imposed and universally acknowledged, may decrease the volume of cyber espionage activity but will fail to tackle more complex cyber threats that represent the greatest danger for all actors involved (2016 p. 30). In addition, Iasiello claimed that the majority of states are active in terms of cybercrime, such as espionage and denial of service attacks (DDoS), the last being linked to the Estonia cyber-attacks in 2007. Along similar lines, Boeke and Broeders argued that too little attention has been paid to foreign intelligence agencies and espionage activities (2018 p. 85). This is because states have been unwilling to address espionage in international forums, 'privileging the freedom or manoeuvre that silence afforded', which results in failing cyber norms (p. 85).

A neo-Gramscian analysis could be insightful in establishing a point of view beyond the existent state-centric approach, which has also been suggested by few critical studies (Carr 2015; Chenou 2014; Simpson 2004). Amongst others, Carr analysed the multistakeholder approach conforming to a Gramscian analysis. Accordingly, Carr argued that the actors in the multistakeholder approach are bound together by a shared ideology and set of normative claims of what cyberspace should be (2015 p. 642). This is in line with a Gramscian conception of hegemonic power through the ability of those dominant actors, especially various elites (Chenou 2014 p. 205) to set the agenda and parameters within which the goal of Internet governance can be considered and developed (Carr 2015 p. 643), but also the internationalization of capitalist production (Simpson 2004 p. 51).

Considering the academic debate, the outlook on the formation of universal cyber norms is perceived to be unsuccessful in most literature. Yet, two fundamental issues seem to pop up in this literature. First, there seems to be an overall focus on the role of states in the (un)success

of cyber-norm building, and the majority of literature lacks to take into consideration the multiplicity of actors of influence such as corporations and civil society in cyberspace, even with regards to the multistakeholder approach. In contrast to the state-centric approach in literature, Iasiello was one of the only studies which acknowledges the involvement of public and private organisations in guiding states to record their attacks and help organise information on cyber activities (Iasiello 2016 p. 32), but did not elaborate more on this findings. Secondly, the literature seems to criticize the multistakeholder approach but does not seem to provide what a successful cyber norm entail. Ideally, international cyber norms guide behaviour with the aim to diminish the risk of cyber conflict, but also guarantee the interest of multiple actors.

2.2.2 The United Nations Groups of Governmental Experts in the Information and Telecommunications in Context of International Security (UN GGEs)

One of the aims of this research is to link the influence of states and corporations to UN multilateral initiative in cyberspace, with regards to global cyber governance for the purpose of making the Internet more secure on a global scale. To investigate UN cyber initiatives, it should be mentioned that, regarding the scope and purpose of this thesis, this section will focus on literature on one of the most prominent UN-mandated cyber governance initiatives, the UN GGEs.

From present literature, it becomes apparent that efforts to regulate cyberspace and formulate cyber norms have been made, especially by international organisations such as the UN, but it is argued that results remain limited so far (Iasiello 2016; Choucri, Madnick, and Ferwerda 2014). Before diving into the UN GGE literature, it is useful to shed more light on what has been said about the role of international organisations, such as the UN in the literature on multistakeholder cyber governance. Nonetheless, the literature on the role of international organisations in the multistakeholder approach of global cyber governance is rather limited (Fliegauf 2016; Mihr 2014; van Horenbeeck 2018). Moreover, opinions are strongly divided on this topic. While Fliegauf contended that international organisations are necessary and could provide 'the rules of the game' (2016 p. 79), Mihr argued that international organisations have been unsuccessful in setting the international guidelines and legally binding treaties for managing cyberspace (2014 p. 26). With the intention to apply critical neo-Gramscian theory to the UN GGEs, it might be insightful to extend the argument of Mihr

by including the influence of hegemonic force and material interests on the successfulness of international organizations setting rules and treaties in cyberspace.

In the cybersecurity literature, the UN GGEs are understood as a prominent cyber governance mechanism that attempts to formulate a global regulating and norm-building framework to establish normative behaviour and rules, as well as to prevent international cyber threats. Previous research on cyber governance and norm building suggests that the UN GGEs will most likely not manage to establish a successful international cyber framework (van der Meer 2015; Meyer 2013; Tikk-Ringas 2016; Kane 2014; Henriksen 2019). This is alarming, but similar to the multistakeholder literature, studies describe the mischief of the UNGGEs to the responsibility of states.

As seen in the multistakeholder approach, most studies depict the UN GGEs as a platform for state power. Although Tikk-Ringas recognised the normative abilities of the UN GGEs, she asserted that the platform is being used by states to encourage their national interests associated with the development of ICT practices (2016 p. 48). For instance, what van der Meer argued is that the UN GGEs have been working on norms, state behaviour, and international law for years, and will likely not to end such work in the short term (van der Meer 2015 p. 203). Yet, the study argues that especially cooperation between states 'are the most promising ways available' to realise lasting international cyber security and permanency. Recently, Henriksen took on a more radical perspective and argued that the failure of the UN GGEs was predictable because states interests, and normative preferences are simply too disparate for consensus (2019 p. 2). Furthermore, he argued that 'we should not expect cyberspace to be regulated by a uniform international legal regime soon' (2019 p. 2).

What a neo-Gramscian analysis could add to this argument are the mechanisms of hegemonic power dynamics, influence, and material interests behind the potential failure and future of the UN GGE. Although most studies point to the failings of the UN GGE, in the study of Kane the breakthroughs are also emphasised, such as the assertion of the applicability of international law to cyberspace (2014). Furthermore, Meyer contended that the UN GGE 2012 group has strongly been influenced by Russian leadership and that its orientation was clearly in line with the objectives being promoted in an earlier agreed-on cyber code between Russia and China (2013 p. 55). Yet, he also stated that the assertion of the relevance of international law to the new domain of cyberspace was a key objective of the US and other Western states (2013 p. 56). Moreover, there is also the absence of private civil society

involvement in elaborating norms. From a neo-Gramscian perspective, this is logical, as hegemony must be preserved by a state–business elite. For this reason, the differing interests of civil society are not that relevant, as they need to adhere to the dominant ideas and ideologies established by the elite. Therefore, it remains to be seen if the UN GGE initiative can contribute significantly to global norm creation, especially as states and corporations articulate differing visons of what constitutes responsible state behaviour in cyberspace.

This literature review described the academic debate on global cyber governance and the UN GGE. What is striking in the cyber governance and UN GGE literature, is the overarching state-centric approach to the success or failure of global cyber governance, norm-building, and the UN GGEs. This is rather limited and controversial to the multistakeholder approach, which advocates the multiplicity of actors involved in cyber governance. For these reasons, neo-Gramscian analysis will be insightful, as it tends to look beyond the state-centric approach and takes into consideration the role of corporations and civil society in a global world order.

2.3 Conclusion of the Literature Review

To sum up, this literature review aimed to assess the current literature on UN multilateralism, the influence of states and corporations on the UN, global cyber governance and the UN GGEs. On both topics of the review, neo-Gramscian theory was presented a feasible; but also innovative approach to this research. A few researchers have highlighted the insights provided by a neo-Gramscian perspective on UN multilateralism, the influence of states and corporations, and cyber governance, and this thesis further builds on that foundation.

What became evident from the literature on the UN system and relations of influence is that states and corporations have a certain degree of influence on UN bodies through their control of the voting mechanism of the UN General Assembly and in the UN Global Compact. Yet, it is surprising that these institutions have not been thoroughly analysed through a neo-Gramscian perspective, as the theory precisely covers relations of influence of both state and corporate actors. Although the study of cyberspace is a relatively new scholarly field, most of the relevant literature concerns realist approaches. Of course, states are important actors in cyber governance and norm building, and their behaviours and roles should guide the process. However, it is too limited to solely ascribe the success or failure of global cyber governance and cyber norm building to the behaviour of states. Rather, although states do play an important role in this area, so do other non-state actors because cyberspace is a policy domain in which many different actors can be involved, ranging from individuals and states to corporations. Therefore, a neo-Gramscian perspective is feasible for this analysis, as it covers processes of norm-building and the multiplicity of actors involved in influencing outcomes.

Chapter 3: Neo-Gramscian theory

'Reading Gramsci today may feel like reading the Bible must have been for early Renaissance scholars.' – Marlies Glasius, 2012, in Gramsci for the Twenty-First Century: Dialectics and Translatability

In Chapter 2 of this paper the relevance and feasibility of neo-Gramscian theory was demonstrated for studying the influence of states and corporations on the UN GGEs. Therefore, this theory will be utilised as the method of this thesis. To elucidate this theory, this chapter focusses on the relevant components of neo-Gramscian theory for this research.

As there is no academic consensus on a single Gramscian theoretical framework, and there are multiple Gramscian schools, neo-Gramscian theory is not easy to define. Because considering all Gramscian accounts and perspectives would go beyond the scope of this thesis, this part of the paper focusses on a few key themes of neo-Gramscian theory defined by Antonio Gramsci himself in his work *The Prison Notebooks* (1971) and the contributions of Robert Cox (1977, 1980, 1983, 1992 1999, 2004). The focus of 'traditional' Gramscian theory is mainly on national social constructions in specific historical eras, in particular to the Italian national political context of the early 20th century. Cox's contributions broadened the scope of traditional Gramscian theory to an international level and covered transnational class relations and power constructions in the world order. Therefore, this understanding is useful in studying the UN GGEs in cyberspace, as it concerns a global context rather than a nation-specific one.

The concepts of interest include organic intellectuals, historical bloc and hegemony, and the role of the state and civil society, which are at the heart of neo-Gramscian theory. These components provide insight into the process of forming a hegemony and the influence of actors, such as states and corporations, involved in the process. Although discussed in different sections, all the theoretical aspects connect and overlap. The following sections shed light on the theoretical components in relation to the UN GGE and global cyber governance.

3.1 The role of intellectuals

'All men are potentially intellectuals in the sense of having an intellect and using it, but not all are intellectuals by social function.' – Gramsci, 1971

The original work of Gramsci (1971), *The Prison Notebooks*, analyses the specific Italian national experience and culture (Hawley 1980 p. 584). In his original theory, there is an emphasis on history and the historical forces which are fundamental to the course of social action. Gramsci distinguished between 'traditional' and 'organic' intellectuals. Specifically, the understanding of the role of *organic* intellectuals is fundamental in organising a dominant social class and achieving enduring hegemony.

According to Gramsci, organic intellectuals can be defined as an intellectual-social group formed in conjunction with an upcoming social class, which represent 'the bourgeoisie' or elite (1971). In addition, they are 'the thinking and organising element of a particular social class' (1971). Essentially, organic intellectuals help an emerging class to become dominant and create a new order. They not only produce ideas but also form complex and competing tactics, and they aim to present their knowledge to the dominant group in society (Gramsci 1971 p. 10; Moolakkattu 2009 p. 443). Moreover, organic intellectuals can come from all parts of society and they are composed together with all social groups in society, particularly in connection with the more important groups, and they experience more extensive and compound elaboration in connection with the dominant social group (Gramsci 1971 p. 10). In Robert Cox's words, organic intellectuals 'serve to clarify the political thinking of social groups, leading the members of these groups to understand their existing situation in society and how in combination with other social groups they can struggle towards a higher form of society' (Cox 1999 p. 16). In terms of the UN GGEs, the members of these groups can be understood as the organic intellectuals, which guide the cyber governance discussions and are representatives of states and organisations. Especially, they are active in cyber norm building, the formation of common ideology and the idea of consensus. Because a dominant group wishes to maintain its power, it requires establishing a consensus with subordinate groups. Therefore, the 'language of consensus' is phrased in universalist terms by the organic intellectuals, while those in power support the dominant group (Cox 1977 p. 387). This phenomenon may be evident from the 'universal' norm-building in cyberspace in the textual analysis of the UN GGE reports.

What is more, intellectuals can be perceived as the representatives of superstructures, which are the political society (or state) and the civil society (1971 p. 12). Along the lines of neo-Gramscian theory, the workings of intellectuals, the state, and civil society are interconnected to the achievement of a 'hegemony' in a social order. Furthermore, the main challenge of organic intellectuals, according to Gramsci (1971 p. 12), 'is the struggle to assimilate and

conquer "ideologically" the traditional intellectuals', which can be find in other social state-civil society groups.

Next to these definitions, there is an essential relationship between organic intellectuals and the world of production in achieving hegemony (Gramsci 1971 p. 12). Intellectuals are the representatives of the dominant group and attempt to influence social hegemony and the political landscape. In effect, a social group can, and must indeed, already 'lead' prior to gaining dominant power (Gramsci 1971 p. 47). The organic intellectuals will be more likely to achieve permission from 'the great masses' of the populace because of the powerful position of a dominant group in the mode of production (Gramsci 1971 p. 12). On this note, the UN already has been a prominent guiding organisation in world politics since the end of the Second World War, and therefore more likely to achieve permission of the great masses. What is important in these dynamics, is that the state should be utilised as an instrument which legally enforces the ideas, ideologies and norms on those who do not consent (Gramsci 1971 p. 12). For this reason, the UN GGE reports are likely to mention the role of states, as they are fundamental in the process of connecting the elite's interest into society. Moreover, the success of a social group, caused by the activities of the organic intellectuals, reveals itself as 'domination' and as 'intellectual and moral leadership' (Gramsci 1971 p. 12). At the same time, when the group of organic intellectuals reach a critical mass in terms of influence, they are capable of organising counter-hegemony to alter the social order—or, in Cox's terms, the global order.

Both Gramsci and Cox noted that organic intellectuals are crucial in the creation and success of a hegemony. They not only try to create a universal ideology in a society in favour of a dominant group, in this case ideology, norms and consensus in cyber governance and norm building, but they also mobilise the state and civil society to go along with it. In their analysis, the concept of organic intellectuals may be applied to the UN GGE's composition and aspirations, as the UN GGE groups consist of both state and non-state actors, with the ambition to establish universal norms, principles, and ideology regarding cyber security. Now that the centrality of organic intellectuals in neo-Gramscian theory is indicated, the following section turns to the importance of the concepts 'historical bloc' and 'hegemony'.

3.2 Historical bloc and hegemony

A 'historical bloc' refers to the process of the formation of social relations and power at a specific time. A historical bloc denotes the process of creating a hegemony. The development of a historical bloc requires an understanding of organic intellectuals but also of state and class. In *The Prison Notebooks*, the concept of a 'historical bloc' refers to a harmony between 'structure and superstructure' (Gramsci 1971). It is a 'dialectical unity between the structure and superstructure, founded on common ideology, allowing the groups in question to overcome any contradictions between theory and practice' (Gramsci 1971). The dominant social group, created by organic intellectuals, will eventually need to increase their capacity to form a historical bloc and start to fight for power. In order to achieve this power, the group requests to form alliances with other socio-economic groups. These alliances are forged by addressing the 'interests and aspirations' of the other socio-economic groups, which are concentrated in the realm of civil society. For this research, the interpretation of these civil society interests centres around the notion of the danger of cyber threats, the need for international cyber security measures, and global cyber governance. Because the interests of a social group in modern capitalist societies are typically economic, it is essential that a hegemonic social group has a central role in the mode of production. When the historical bloc is unable to meet the economic interests of its alliance members, the bloc is likely to fail. That is, the UN GGEs must meet the economic interests of its alliance members, which are the interests of the states and organisations involved in the UNGGEs and global cyber governance.

According to Gramscian thought, hegemony consists of norms, values, social relations, and political practices in society because of a certain dominant way of thinking (Katz 2006 p. 335). Along the lines of Gramsci's ideas, three ways in which socioeconomic groups can achieve hegemony emerge (Gramsci 1971; Appendix 1.1). Firstly, a group should have hegemonic aspirations and interests (Cafruny 2016 p. 76). Secondly, the group must begin to create a 'historical economic-political bloc', which refers to building partnerships and collaborating with other groups, as well as formulating an internal ideology within the group that articulates the interests of the hegemonic class in the historical bloc. What Gramsci emphasised is that such a historical bloc is not just a political alliance but rather a collective of 'ideas and social relations' (Hawley 1980 p. 586). Thirdly, in order to maintain the hegemony, economic growth and wealth should be guaranteed (Cafruny 2016 p. 76). In addition, Cox argued that these stages are followed by the rise of a hegemon, the spread of its ideology, and

the international extension of the system based on material power and ideology (Cox 1977). In essence, the development of a historical bloc is associated with the specific economic or corporate interests of a group, the solidarity of the groups, and the formation of common interests and ideology of a dominant class (Cox 1983 p. 57). This last stage also includes the expression of ideology in universal terms and the integration of ideology in, for instance, institutions. In fact, the end goal of a historical bloc is the creation of a hegemony. In addition, Cox asserted that 'hegemony derives from the ways of doing and thinking of the dominant social strata of the dominant state or states insofar the ways of doing and thinking have inspired emulation or acquired the acquiescence of the dominant social strata of other states' (Cox 1992 p. 179). These social practices and principles clarify and legitimise the underpinnings of the hegemonic order (Cox 1992 p. 179). Moreover, a hegemony or hegemon may or may not emerge; the outcome is not compulsory or essential in neo-Gramscian theory. What is important is that a hegemon is not necessarily a specific state, institution, or individual. Rather, it is a consequence of a dominant social group, consisting of multiple individuals, including organic intellectuals, in relation to the mode of production. In this analysis, the UN GGEs.

What Cox proposed is that the issue of hegemony at the level of the global political economy is not just a national but also a transnational, regional, and local issue (1999 p. 12). The neo-Gramscian understanding of international and transnational hegemony is based on historical and social theory (Beiling 2014 p. 37). Cox also underlined the importance of determining the beginning and end of hegemonic domination when analysing hegemony (Cox 1983 p. 60). Additionally, economic interdependence and the transnational dimension of social relationships including forms of 'discursive, cultural and politico-institutional organisation of dominance and consensus come into view' (Beiling 2014 p. 37). In terms of institutions in hegemony, Cox argued that 'institutions reflect the power relations prevailing at their point of origin and tend, at least initially, to encourage collective images consistent with these power relations' (1981 p. 136). Essentially, Cox assumed that institutions seem to reflect ideas and material power of the historical bloc, the UN GGEs.

In addition, Cox's notion of global governance in hegemony is of significance; according to Cox, this concept 'suggests control and orientation in the absence of formally coercive power' (Cox 1999 p. 12). In this regard, the UN might also be perceived as an institutional organisation of dominance and universalist terms. As there is no formally established global cyber governance mechanism, the UN GGE may be an apparatus of 'control and orientation'

but also a multilateral institution to reproduce and reassure existing capitalist power relations. Now that the concepts of historical bloc and hegemony have been extensively described, the following section will focus on the role of the state and civil society in the construction of a hegemony.

3.3 The roles of the state and civil society

The role of both the state and civil society are fundamental in the creation of a hegemony. It is also the topic on which Gramsci and Cox diverge the most in their theoretical approaches. The component of civil society or 'the social movement' is important to include in research on the UN GGEs, as civil society is also likely to be affected by cyber threats.

Gramsci perceived the state to be a historical bloc of an explicit ruling class (D'Attoma 2011 p.3). In *The Prison Notebooks*, Gramsci understood the state as a unity of political society and civil society, which means the state is the actor in unifying domination and consent. In particular, he referred to the so-called 'integral state' when the state symbolises practical and theoretical tasks with which the ruling class upholds its dominance and manages to win consent over those whom it rules (Hoare and Sperber 2016). Gramsci considered civil society as an essential part of the state, and he was convinced that the complex, organic relationships between civil society and political society empower certain strata of society not only to increase dominance within the state but also to sustain it (Buttigieg 1995 p. 4). For Gramsci, state and civil society partly forms the base that continues the hegemony of the elite, but it also provides a platform on which a counter-hegemony can be formed.

The meaning of civil society in the past according to Gramsci, is that it is another expression for social power relations stemming from the economy (Cox 1999 p. 10). In contrast, Cox identified that, in the modern world, 'civil society has become the term for various ways in which people express collective wills independently of (and often in opposition to) established power, both economic and political' (Cox 1999 p. 10). What is relevant today, according to Cox, is the division between dominant power over the society distributed by corporations, states, and 'the popular forces on the other' (1999 p. 10). He also referred to the notion that civil society is currently comprehended as an 'autonomous' group distinct from both state and corporate authority (1999 p. 10). In fact, he argued that, in the modern world, there is a sharper line between the state and civil society, which Gramsci perceived to be in connection with each other. In a more recent study, Cox acknowledged three configurations of

power in the modern global political economy: the 'global state' consisting of, amongst others, a unity of states, transnational corporations and ideologies, sovereign nation states, and civil society (2004 p. 208–310).

What is more, a global hegemon links to processes of state retrenchment, which results in fewer social facilities and protections for the civil society, leading to less loyalty for the political structure. In other words, because of the power of global hegemon, for example a hegemon state or corporation, civil society becomes more critical about its national political authorities, which will ultimately create more tension and discontent in a country (Cox 1999 p. 13). Moreover, he mentioned that civil society in the late 20th century is the reflection of the dominance of state and corporate economic power. Furthermore, he stated that civil society can be understood from a 'bottom-up' perspective, which includes those left out by the globalisation of the global economy and protests, or a 'top-down' method, which entails the influence of the agendas of states and businesses in shaping the civil society as an instrument for balancing the social and political status quo (Cox 1999 p. 11). The bottom-up approach to studying civil society and hegemony also relates to the Gramscian idea of a 'war of opposition' or 'counter-hegemony', which suggests that a link between oppositional groups and the intellectuals could develop and form a force that could fight against the entrenched state power. As this research focusses on the influence of states and corporations, the 'top-down' is more relevant here for the study of the UN GGEs.

What is of utter importance in achieving hegemony, is the consent of civil society. All in all, the concept of state and civil society relations in neo-Gramscian theory has changed over time. Currently, Cox's contribution appears to be much more in line with contemporary global politics with the examination of global cyber governance and the UN GGEs. As the appropriate theoretical concepts of neo-Gramscian theory are established, the following section will discuss how these concepts are put into practice for this research.

Chapter 4: Methodology *Analysing the UN GGEs*

This thesis focusses on neo-Gramscian theory through a qualitative method and applies document analysis to official UN GGE documents (Bryman 2012 p. 549). The documents were analysed through textual examination in accordance with the relevant theoretical components of neo-Gramscian theory: organic intellectuals, historical bloc and hegemony, and the role of the state and civil society discussed in the previous section. The documents of interest consist of three UN GGE reports. The reports, date from 2010, 2013, and 2015, which are the only publicly available documents related to the UN GGE's work and composition in these years.

Also, these reports were highlighted by existing literature (van der Meer 2015; Meyer 2012; Tikk-Ringas 2016; Kane 2014; Henriksen 2019), the Geneva Internet Platform (GIP), an initiative created by the non-profit organisation DiploFoundation to ensure 'a neutral and inclusive space for digital policy debates' (GIP Platform 2019), and various global cyber governance reports (UNIDIR and CSIS 2010; Microsoft 2014; CIVICUS 2014; Commission on Global Security, Justice & Governance 2015). In addition, these specific reports are of interest because of major worldwide cyber-attacks in and around these years, amongst others the Russian cyber-attack on the Estonian infrastructure in 2007, the 2010 Myanmar cyber-attacks, and the Singapore 2013 attacks (appendix 1.4). In this regard, these attacks and prior reports mark the beginning of international acknowledgement of the far-reaching risks of cyber treats and the need for regulation of cyberspace. In the aim of extending the existing literature and research, these specific reports were chosen for analysis.

The problem with document analysis is that it may result in issues regarding credibility or representativeness (Bryman 2012 p. 550). Therefore, to strengthen this analysis and provide more legitimate insights into to the influence of states and corporations on the UN GGE, external documents, reports, and information involving the UN GGEs 2010, 2013, and 2015 meetings and recommendations were also included, such as the reports from the corporation Microsoft (2014) and civil society alliances (2014, 2015). In the end, the analysis will conclude whether neo-Gramscian theory of hegemony, and the influence and interests of states and multinational corporations, could be successfully or unsuccessfully drawn from the UN GGE reports.

The UN GGEs are one of the major global cyber governance initiatives of the UN but seem to continuously fail in establishing consensus in cyberspace. In brief, the 2010 UN GGE report

includes recommendations for dialogue amongst states, measures of confidence-building, information exchange, and the elaboration of common terms and definitions (UN GGE 2010). The 2013 report reaches other conclusions and recognises the role of international law manifested in the UN Charter in terms of cyberspace norms, rules, and principles of behaviour for states (GIP 2019), state sovereignty, and 'international obligations [the] state is expected to meet' (UN GGE 2013). The 2015 report encompasses more norms, rules, and principles regarding the behaviour of states, confidence-building measures, international cooperation, and assistance in ICT security, as well as how international law applies to the use of ICTs (UN GGE 2015).

4.1 Background information the UN GGEs

Before going into the case studies, it is helpful to provide more background on what the UN GGEs entail. Therefore, this section elaborates more on what the UN GGEs are and how they were established. The UN GGEs are UN-authorised workgroups in the field of information technology and cybersecurity. So far, there have been nine groups (Appendix 1.2). These groups were established in 2004 by the United Nations General Assembly's first committee (Henderson 2015 p. 474). The formation of these groups had already been initiated in 1998 when the Russian Federation suggested that Internet security should become part of the UN agenda (Digital Watch 2019; Lewis and Vignard 2016). The GGE groups have become part of customary UN global governance initiatives in the fields of sustainability (Shuval 1975), refugee flows (Lee 1987), and conflict resolution (Ratner 1999). Moreover, the GGEs are one of the first UN initiatives regarding cyberspace, security, and threats. Since 2004, the GGE's members have studied cyber threats and how these should be tackled. Overall, the themes of the reports are concerned with state behaviour, cooperative measures, as well as confidence- and capacity-building measures (Henderson 2015 p. 477).

As published by the United Nations Office for Disarmament Affairs (2019), there seems to have been no consensus in the 2004–2005 (the first cyber GGE) and the 2016–2017 GGE meetings (UNODA Factsheet 2014; Appendix 2.1), but according to the existing literature results of the UN GGEs have remained limited so far (van der Meer 2015; Meyer 2013; Tikk-Ringas 2016; Kane 2014; Henriksen 2019). According to the report of the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research (UNDIR) and the Centre for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS) on the International Security Cyber Issues Workshop Series (Lewis and Vignard 2016) in 2010, 'achieving consensus in the GGEs is a demanding task because of the time limitations, the difficulty of the subject, but also the range of national views' (Lewis and Vignard 2016 p. 3). Since the first meeting of the GGE, the groups have not always come to a common agreement easily (Henderson 2015 p. 474).

To fully grasp these failing outcomes, it is useful to illuminate the formation of the GGEs. As established by the report of Lewis and Vignard, in the UN's First Committee, the mandate for a potential GGE group was drafted. According to the UN, the First Committee 'deals with disarmament, global challenges, and treats and seeks out solutions to the challenges in the international security regime' (un.org 2019). Then, the UN's First Committee recommended that the General Assembly send a request to the secretary-general for the formation of a group (Lewis and Vignard 2016 p. 4). What is interesting is that the five permanent members of the

Security Council (China, Russia, France, the United Kingdom, and the United States) have a seat on all GGEs. The rest of the members are assigned by regional groupings in the UN system (Lewis and Vignard 2016 p. 4). Thereafter, the members of the group are requested to appoint 'an expert' who takes part in the GGE. This could be a government representative, but also a cybersecurity professional or an arms control deputy. Moreover, the GGE needs to appoint a chair of the group. In 2010, 2013, and 2015, the Russian Federation, Australia, and Brazil chaired the GGEs (Lewis and Vignard 2016 p. 5). Initially, the GGE consisted of 15 members in total (2004–2005, 2009–2010, 2012–2013). Over the past years, the number of members of the more recent groups has almost doubled relative to the first groups (Appendix 2.1). In addition, the General Assembly decided on an 'Open Ended Working Group' (OEWG) next to a new GGE for the 2019–2021 period, which would involve all member states of the UN' (UNODA Factsheet 2019). When the work of a GGE has come to an end, the members advise other member states to consider their recommendations. Yet, the recommendations of the GGEs are not legally binding, so states are free to choose what to do with the recommendations (Lewis and Vignard 2016 p. 6). The recommendations are openly published in the form of reports, published by the United Nations General Assembly, and transmitted by the former secretary- general.

Chapter 5: Document analysis UN GGE 2010, 2013, and 2015 reports

In this section, the UN GGE 2010, 2013, and 2015 reports are discussed in light of neo-Gramscian theory. In accordance with the theoretical framework, the focus here is on the applicability of the concepts of organic intellectuals, historical bloc and hegemony, and the roles of the state and civil society in the UN GGE reports. All this concepts and stages are relevant for the establishment of enduring hegemony, but also for the research of the influence of the interests of a dominant class in the UN GGEs. If conditions are not met, hegemony will not succeed.

5.1 Organic intellectuals

Following the work of Gramsci (1971), it is feasible to hypothesise that the impact of cyber threats on world politics has produced the conditions for the emergence of a new socio-economic 'historical bloc', the UN GGEs, the UN multilateral cyber initiative, determined to become a global political hegemon in cyberspace. Accordingly, the intellectual foundation of the UN GGEs was created by 'organic' intellectuals rather than 'traditional' intellectuals. As mentioned earlier, organic intellectuals help in the creation of a dominant class through formulating ideas, organising, and giving 'their knowledge to the powerful in society'. The construction of a historical bloc relies on the vital role of intellectuals in spreading ideology and accomplishing enduring hegemony. It is not necessary a state or a corporation that influences the UN GGEs, it is a dominant class or elite which exists of multiple individuals coming from various sectors who have a certain material interest and exercise influence. As established, the UNGGES are guided by representatives of states, but also IT experts and international organisations, which try to articulate the need of common norms, alliance forming and cooperation through the UN GGE reports.

What the UN 2010, 2013, and 2015 reports have in common is the emphasis on norm-building, ideology, and consensus necessary for successful global cyber governance. Even more, there is an emphasis on the creation of 'additional norms' which could be developed over time 'relevant to the use of ICTs by states' (UN GGE 2010 p. 8). For these reasons, the members involved in the UN GGEs could be regarded as organic intellectuals, having the aim and purpose to establish universal norms, ideas and ideology in order to create and achieve lasting hegemony in global cyberspace.

In its recommendations, the 2010 report suggests that the UN GGEs 'elaborate on common terms and definitions', as well as 'further dialogue amongst states to discuss norms pertaining to state use of ICTs' (UN GGE 2010 p. 8). In the following report, the UN GGE 2013 'offers in the present report its recommendations to promote peace and stability in State use of ICTs' (UN GGE 2013 p. 2). It also states that 'international law and the United Nations Charter [are] applicable and . . . essential to maintaining peace and stability' (UN GGE 2013 p. 2). Essentially, the principles of the UN should be perceived as guidance for the behaviour of actors involved. It is claimed that, 'common understanding on norms, rules, and principles applicable to the use of ICTs by states and voluntary confidence-building measures can play an important role in advancing peace and security' (UN GGE 2013 p. 6). While the report continues to underscore the lack of common understanding amongst states and actors involved, and the need for adherence to UN norms.

In the 2015 publication, it is mentioned that 'the present report significantly expands the discussion on norms', but the confidence and capacity-building measures are also highlighted (UN GGE 2015 p. 2). Furthermore, the 'present group offers the following recommendations for consideration by states for voluntary, non-binding norms, rules, or principles of responsible behaviour of states aimed at promoting an open, secure, stable, accessible, and peaceful ICT environment' (UN GGE 2015 p. 7). The report continues with a list of recommendations of acceptable state behaviours in cyberspace.

In Gramscian terms, there is an indispensable relationship between organic intellectuals and the world of production in attaining hegemony (Gramsci 1871 p. 12), which will be elaborated on more extensively in the next section. Nevertheless, the state should be utilised as an instrument which legally enforces the ideas, ideologies and norms on those who do not consent (Gramsci 1971 p. 12). The role and the behaviour of states is also extensively emphasised. Moreover, the success of a social group, caused by the activities of the organic intellectuals, reveals itself as 'domination' and as 'intellectual and moral leadership' (Gramsci 1971 p. 12), which is created by the standardising of norms. In terms of intellectual and moral leadership, and the usage of the state the organic intellectuals of the UN GGEs seem to foster these processes by historical and contemporary power of the UN, but also the extensive emphasis on norms and the behaviour of states. However, in order to achieve hegemony, it is necessary to strengthen the group of intellectuals.

5.2 Historical bloc and hegemony

Fundamentally, reaching authority entails the creation of alliances with other socio-economic actors. These alliances are found by addressing their interests and aspirations, which are formed in the realm of civil society (Gramsci 1971). With regard to the UN GGEs, the specific interests and aspirations here could be interpreted as the danger of cyber threats and the need for establishing international rules in cyberspace. The formation of alliances could be perceived in cooperative measures and in the development of associations or agreements. In the UN GGE reports, the need for cooperative measures is heavily emphasised.

For instance, the 2010 report mentions that 'collaboration amongst states and between states, the private sector and civil society, is important' (UN GGE 2010 p. 8). In addition, it is suggested that 'close international cooperation will be needed to build capacity in states that may require assistance in addressing the security of their ICTs' (UN GGE 2010 p. 8).In terms of alliance-formation, the 2013 report mentions that, 'while states must lead in addressing these challenges, effective cooperation would benefit from the appropriate participation of the private sector and civil society' (UN GGE 2013 p. 7). Furthermore, the central role of the UN in developing a common understanding of the security of and the use of ICT is again emphasised (UN GGE 2013 p. 7).

In the end, in contrast to the 2010 report, the 2013 report provides far more recommendations. These suggestions relate to norm-building, international law, the role of states in cyber security measures, and the idea that states 'should encourage the private sector and civil society to play an appropriate role to improve security of an in the use of ICTs' (UN GGE 2013 p. 8). Other recommendations concern confidence-building measures, exchanges of information, capacity building, and the idea that 'states working with international organisations, including the United Nations agencies and the private sector, should consider how best to provide technical and other assistance to build capacities in the ICT security' (UN GGE 2013 p. 9). Moreover, it is mentioned that states should engage in 'further analysis and study by research institutions and universities on matters related to ICT security' (UN GGE 2013 p. 9). Additionally, it is mentioned that states should engage in 'further analysis and study by research institutions and universities on matters related to ICT security' (UN GGE 2013 p. 9).

Also, in the 2010 and 2013 reports, it is mentioned that 'valuable efforts are being made by international organizations and regional entities such as the African Union, the Association of

Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN), the Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation Forum, the Council of Europe, the Economic Community of West African States, the European Union, the League of Arab States, the Organization of American States, the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE), and the Shanghai Cooperation Organization (2010 p. 7; 2013 p. 7), which could be regarded as 'alliance members' of the UN GGEs.

In agreement with the 2010 and 2013 report, the 2015 report indicates that, 'while states have a primary responsibility for maintaining a secure and peaceful ICT environment, effective international cooperation would benefit from identifying mechanisms for the participation, as appropriate, of the private sector, academia, and civil society organisations' (UN GGE 2015 p. 13). Not surprisingly, the text suggests that the UN should play a leading role in promoting dialogue and developing a common understanding regarding norms, rules, and principles for responsible state behaviour (UN GGE 2015 p. 13).

In the end, it is once more mentioned that 'while states have a primary responsibility for maintaining a secure and peaceful ICT environment, effective international cooperation would benefit from identifying mechanisms for the participation, as appropriate, of the private sector, academia and civil society organisations' (UN GGE 2015 p. 13). Not surprisingly, the text also indicates that the UN should play a leading role in promoting dialogue and developing common understandings on norms, rules, and principles for responsible state behaviour (UN GGE 2015 p. 13). According to the reports, the UN should play a leading role in promoting dialogue and developing a common understanding regarding norms, rules, and principles for responsible state behaviour (UN GGE 2015 p. 13).

However, the progress of a historical bloc is more than just an alliance; it is a 'unity between structure and superstructure', grounded in common ideology, so that the alliances can overcome any inconsistencies. Thereby, the economic dimension is crucial. It is a condition that the dominant group can only be one with an essential role in the mode of production. A bloc which is incapable of guaranteeing the economic interests of its allies is destined to fail. While the corporate interests of the UN GGEs remain speculative as they are not explicitly mentioned in the reports, except that cyber threats 'may cause substantial damage to economies' (2010 p. 6), 'target individuals, businesses (210 p. 6), form 'threats to individuals, business, national infrastructures (..) grown more acute and incidents more damaging'' (2013 p. 6), and that 'states are rightfully concerned about the danger (..) the potential for conflict and the possibility to harm their citizens, property and economy (2015 p. 6), it is necessary to investigate more extensively what the corporate interests of the UN GGEs are in terms of

global cyber governance and how it aligns with its hegemonic ambitions. Although the exact interests remain hypothetical from the reports only, there are a few indications of corporate interests of the organic intellectuals in the UNGGEs and its alliances.

First and foremost, from the existing literature, it became evident that the UN has become increasingly engaged with multinational corporations, which can be interpreted as the UN achieving a stronger position in the mode of production and even in the field of cybersecurity. For example, ICT corporations, which could be perceived as alliances of the UN (and thus the UN GGEs), are involved in the UN Global Compact database; specialised in software and computer services, these corporations include organisations such as PomTech ICT Solutions, ICT Consulting, and ICT AG (unglobalcompact.org 2019).

In addition to increased corporate involvement in the UN, Microsoft (2014) also published its own report on the global cyber governance and international cybersecurity norms. This report was published after the 2013 Global Cyberspace Cooperation Summit organised in Berlin, in which policymakers, corporate leaders, and technical experts met to discuss matters in international cyberspace and to develop standards of behaviour (cybersummit.info 2019). In the report of this Summit, cooperation between governments and private stakeholders was also highlighted (EastWest Insitute 2014 p. 24).

Interestingly, the recommendations in the Microsoft report seem strikingly similar to the UNGGE 2010, 2013, and 2015 recommendations. For instance, norms for state behaviour and are also heavily emphasised, alongside the significance of multinational corporations in global cyber governance (McKay, Nicholas, Neutze and Sullivan 2014 p. 11–13). Additionally, the report also indicates that states should 'assist' private sector activities 'to detect, respond to, and recover from events in cyberspace' (McKay, Nicholas, Neutze and Sullivan 2014 p. 20). Moreover, researchers have pointed out the 'need' for the multistakeholder approach in setting cybersecurity norms (McKay, Nicholas, Neutze and Sullivan 2014 p. 14). As expressed in the neo-Gramscian literature, the multistakeholder approach entails the shared capitalist ideology, the unequal representation of actors, and the hegemonic power of elites to set the rules for Internet governance. In neo-Gramscian theory, these measures can be regarded as necessary to form and conserve political and social hegemony in global cyberspace. On the whole, it is likely that the UN and the UN GGEs entail business involvement and thus interests.

5.3 The roles of the state and civil society

As specified by neo-Gramscian theory, the roles of the state and civil society are crucial in the creation of a hegemony. In the UN GGE reports, the state and civil society are strongly recommended to cooperate. The UN GGE reports advise states to adhere to and help establish norm-building processes, as well as to cooperate with other states and non-state actors in relation to information and activities on cyber threats. All three reports contain an extensive list of recommendations regarding appropriate state behaviour. According to Gramsci, the 'integral state' symbolises practical and theoretical tasks with which the ruling class maintains its dominance and manages to gain acceptance from the people it rules. As Gramsci perceived the state as a force unifying political and civil society, the state is the actor which aligns the UN GGE guidelines and civil society's interests. In other words, there is an emphasis on the role of the state since it is in the middle of the dominant group and civil society, having the ability to integrate both levels, especially to gain consent and legally enforce the ideas, ideologies, and norms on those who do not consent (Gramsci 1971 p. 12). Gramsci considered civil society as an essential part of the state, and he was convinced that the complex, organic relationships between civil society and political society empower certain strata of society not only to increase dominance within the state but also to sustain it (Buttigieg 1995 p. 4). In this regard, as civil society is part of the state's consent there is no need to address civil society separately. Yet, Gramsci acknowledged that organic intellectuals joining 'traditional' intellectuals -which originate from state and civil society- could formulate a form of counter-hegemony.

In contrast to Gramsci's analysis, in Cox's analysis, there does exist an autonomous civil society which should have certain functions and beliefs. As seen from the theoretical framework, Cox acknowledged three levels of power in the modern global political economy: the 'global state' consisting of a union of states, transnational corporations, ideologies, nation states, and civil society, amongst other elements (2004 p. 208–310). In fact, Cox argued that, in the modern world, there is a strong division between the state and civil society, which Gramsci perceived as being connected to and integrated within each other.

According to this analysis, as a global hegemon in cyberspace, the UN GGEs could foster developments such as state retrenchment, which results in fewer social facilities and protections for the civil society, resulting in less devotion to the state's political structure. Along these lines, the UN GGEs causes civil society to become more critical about national political authorities, ultimately creating more tension and discontent in a country (Cox 1999 p.

13). As an addition to the work of Gramsci, Cox stated that, in the modern world, 'civil society has become the term for various ways in which people express collective wills independently of (and often in opposition to) established power, both economic and political' (Cox 1999 p. 10). In other words, civil society is not intertwined with state politics but constitutes an autonomous entity in the international system and could therefore organise a counter hegemony on its own, which could reduce the power of an upcoming hegemon.

Because of the lack of engagement with civil society described in the UN GGE reports, it is like the analyses of corporate interests necessary to examine civil society's view about global cyber governance. In order to examine civil society as an independent entity, it is necessary to investigate what civil society says about global cyber governance, norm building and the UN GGEs, as there is a lack of civil society engagement and consent in the UN GGE reports. In 2014 and 2015, reports of the civil society organisations CIVICUS, and the Commission on Global Security, Justice & Governance on global cyber governance and the UN GGE were published. Remarkably, the 2014 global cyber governance report of one of largest global civil society alliances, CIVICUS, confirms that the development of international norms on cyber security is 'by invitation' and 'largely restricted to governments and business' (CIVICUS 2014 p. 90). Moreover, it states that 'civil society has proved very effective at reacting to [cyber] threats' (2014 p. 91), but that '[Civil Society] is caught between governments who would quite happily see civil society relegated to the sidelines and other governments that see little or nothing wrong with the regime as it currently functions' (CIVICUS 2014 p. 93). Evidently, the report claims that civil society is not considered as it should be with regards to current global cyber governance approaches.

In addition, the report on global cyber governance by the Commission on Global Security, Justice, & Governance, the members which consist of former ministers and UN deputies, suggests that the UN GGE 'should be tasked with drawing up a report on the application of secondary rules of international law, in particular on state responsibility and countermeasures, in cyberspace, taking due account of international human rights instruments and the view of the multistakeholder community' (Commission on Global Security, Justice, & Governance 2015 p. 70). Moreover, instead of a UN mandate in cyberspace,

> the Commission recommends taking forward INTERPOL's pioneering work in this area . . . including . . . cybercrime experts who assist countries in the Global South in developing critical cybersecurity capabilities . . . and encourage the establishment of additional regional offices in this area and improve cooperation between the United

> Nations and regional organisations. (Commission on Global Security, Justice, & Governance 2015 p. 71)

Comparing the recommendations of the UN GGE 2010, 2013, and 2015 reports with those of this civil society report, there seems to be a lack of civil society consent in the UN GGEs recommendations. In addition, the UN GGEs recommendations seem to favour state and corporate interest, in particular of state-business elites, over civil society interest. According to Cox's neo-Gramscian perspective, because of a lack of civil society consent, hegemony could not prevail and might even result in a counter hegemony. For this reason, the UN GGEs are not successful in establishing global hegemony in cyber governance as consensus is not reached.

Chapter 6: Conclusion

All things considered, the UN GGE 2010, 2013, and 2015 reports are lacking in terms of civil society engagement, interests, and consent. Therefore, the UN GGEs are more influenced by the interests of state and corporate elites; consequently also affect the outcome of the UN multilateral cyber initiative, the UN GGE, more than civil society when viewed from a neo-Gramscian perspective. However, because of the lack of civil society consent, UN GGE hegemony in global cyber governance does not prevail.

Regarding the intensity of global cyber threats affecting states, corporations, and civil society, a multilateral framework in global cyber governance could be a major step in preventing and diminishing cyber threats. So far, there has been limited number of successful global cyber governance initiatives (e.g. the UN GGEs). Neo-Gramscian theory, especially the combination of Gramsci and Cox's work in studying power dynamics and interests in the global world order, is relevant in studying these subjects because it allows for the consideration of the varying interests and ambitions of state, corporate, and civil society organisations even in modern-day political issues (e.g. cyber security). Therefore, this theory provides a more comprehensive approach than liberal, realist, or constructivist approaches.

The purpose of this thesis is to demonstrate the influence of states and corporations on the UN-mandated UN GGEs according to neo-Gramscian theory. From the existing literature, it appears that states and multinational corporations are important actors in the modern-day UN multilateral system, such as in UN bodies (e.g. the UN General Assembly voting mechanism) and the UN Global Compact. Moreover, both states and corporations are involved in the multistakeholder approach to global cyber governance and cybersecurity. Yet, most studies in the present literature ascribe the flaws of the multistakeholder approach and the UN GGEs in establishing global cybersecurity to the misconduct of states, and researchers have not thoroughly considered the influence of overlapping or differing interests of corporations or civil society, which may lead to inadequate outcomes. In addition, overall, researchers have only used neo-Gramscian theory on these subjects to a limited degree, but this innovative and multifaceted approach served the purpose of this research.

In order to research hegemony and the influence of states and multinational corporations in global cyber governance, the UN GGEs were analysed in accordance with the fundamentals of neo-Gramscian hegemony theory: organic intellectuals, the formation of a historical bloc and hegemony, and the roles of the state and civil society. When researching the UN GGE

2010, 2013, and 2015 reports, it appeared that there was an overarching emphasis on the role and behaviour of states in cyberspace, which should act in accordance with the UN-imposed cyber norms to establish a secure international cyber environment. In traditional Gramscian theory, this is not surprising, as the function of the state entails integrating the elite with civil society; therefore, the state should follow and impose the recommended norms. In terms of corporate and civil society involvement, the reports are less explicit. Thus, it was useful to investigate reports on what corporations and civil society would perceive as successful norm building and action in cyberspace. What became evident is that the recommendations in the Microsoft (2014) report are strikingly similar to the UN GGEs recommendations and also focussed on the role of states. In contrast, the civil society reports (2014, 2015) present different solutions and recommendations for the establishment of norms and even the role of the UN in global cyber governance and cybersecurity. Although traditional Gramscian theory explains that the state and civil society could be studied as a single entity, Cox clearly identified civil society as an autonomous grouping on which a counter hegemony could be formed. What is fundamental is that both state and civil society consent to the success or failure of a hegemon. The lower the civil society consent, the more counter-hegemonic forces could develop. The reports of the civil society organisations CIVICUS (2014) and the Commission on Global Security, Justice, & Governance (2015) (both alliances of NGO's, civil society groups and independent non-partisan research institutions) include oppositional recommendations and even a certain extent of resentment against the UN as a global cyber actor. As there are opposing recommendations in the UN GGE reports and the civil society alliances' reports, along with limited civil society engagement in the UN GGE, it was interpreted that hegemony cannot prevail. Furthermore, the interests of the elites, with state and corporate actors, had more representation than civil society interests did. Perhaps the multistakeholder approach and the UN GGEs might be more successful, if civil society is strongly represented and participates. As civil society actors can be as significantly affected by cybercrime as states and multinational corporations, the lack of representation is a serious issue.

However, this research is limited in two main ways: theoretically and methodically. To begin with, it was out of the scope of this thesis to cover all concepts in neo Gramscian theory, and therefore the theoretical framework was only limited to certain concepts. As it became evident that the particular neo-Gramscian theoretical components could not provide all the answers to the research question, other Gramscian contributions and concepts, critical and IR theory,

might be an interesting additional perspective for the analysis of the UN GGEs, cyber norm-building, global cyber governance, and the influence of states and corporations.

The UN GGEs are not an easy subject of analysis, as only a small number of reports contain publicly available information on this topic. In addition, this thesis only focussed on three authentic UN GGE reports, which does not provide an accurate overview of all the work and progress ever made by the UN GGEs in the field of cyberspace. Likewise, it does not offer full insights into all the functions and motivations of the UN GGEs. Moreover, the UN GGEs are one of the main UN cyber initiatives, but there are more global cyber governance initiatives from the NATO, the European Union, and corporations to study. Perhaps, the conclusions of this research might not be evident in the initiatives of these organisations. Moreover, the most prominent issues of UN GGE document analysis are issues of credibility and representativeness. Document analysis through a neo-Gramscian perspective revealed a lack of information on the corporate, state, and civil society involvement necessary for this research. To bridge this gap, external reports were used with the best intentions, but these documents do not fully solve the issues of credibility and representativeness. It should also be mentioned that research and debate on global cyber governance, cybersecurity, and cyber threats are relatively new phenomena, and information is still developing. For these reasons, in the future, researchers could investigate more extensively the links between neo-Gramscian theory, UN multilateralism, and global cyber governance. In line with the existing literature and by the findings of this study, there still seems to be still a long way to go before the establishment of global cyber governance.

Bibliography

Barnett, Michael N. 1997. ''Review Bringing in the New World Order: Liberalism, Legitimacy and the United Nations''. *World Politics* 49 (4): 526-551.

Berliner, Daniel and Aseem Prakash. 2014. ''The United Nations Global Compact: An Institutionalist Perspective''. *Journal of Business Ethics* 122: 217-223.

Bersick, Sebastian, Wim Stokhof and Paul van der Velde. 2006. "Multiregionalism and Multilateralism: Asian-European relations in a global context". Amsterdam University Press, Amsterdam.

Bhanji, Zahra. 2008. ''Transnational corporations in education: filling the governance gap through new social norms and market multilateralism?''. *Globalisation, Societies and Education* 6 (1): 55-73.

Bieling, Hans-Jürgen. 2014. ''Comparative analysis of capitalism from a regulationist perspective extended by neo-Gramscian IPE''. *Capital & Class* 38 (1): 31-43.

Boeke, Sergei and Dennis Broeders. 2018. ''The Demilitarisation of Cyber Conflict''. *Survival* 60 (6):73-90.

Brazys, Samuel and Diana Panke. 2017. ''Why do states change positions in the United Nations General Assembly?''. *International Political Science Review* 38 (1): 70-84.

Bryman, Alan. 2012. ''Social Research Methods''. Fourth Edition. Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Butler, Bob and Irving Lachow. 2012. "Multilateral Approaches for Improving Global Security in Cyberspace". *Georgetown Journal of International Affairs*: 5-14.

Buttigieg, Joseph A. 1995. ''Gramsci on Civil Society''. *Boundary* 2 (22): 1-32.

Cafruny, Alan W. 2016. ''The Palgrave Handbook of Critical International Political Economy''. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Carr, Madeline. 2015. ''Power Plays in Global Internet Governance''. *Millenium: Journal of International Studies* 43 (2):640-659.

Carter, David B. and Randall W. Stone. 2015. ''Democracy and Multilateralism: The Case of Vote Buying in the UN General Assembly''. *International Organization* 69 (1): 1-33.

Center for Strategic and International Studies. ''Significant Cyber Incidents''. Csis.org. https://www.csis.org/programs/technology-policy-program/significant-cyber-incidents (accessed May 20, 2019).

Chandrakanth, R. 2015. ''Cyber Security, a Looming Global Threat''. Distributed by Contify.com, Dow Jones. Guide Publications: 1-2.

Chenou, Jean-Marie. 2014. ''From Cyber-Libertarianism to Neoliberalism: Internet Exceptionalism, Multi-stakeholderism, and the Institutionalisation of Internet Governance in the 1990s. *Globalizations* 11(2): 206-223.

Choucri, Nazli, Stuart Madnick & Jeremy Ferwerda. 2014. ''Institutions for Cyber Security: International Responses and Global Imperatives. *Information Technology for Development* 20 (2): 96-121.

CIVICUS. 2014. ''State of civil society report: Reimagining Global Governance''. Published by CIVICIUS: World Alliance for Citizen Participation. Accessed June 17, 2019. https://www.civicus.org/images/stories/SOCS%202014.pdf.

Claude, Inis L.1958. ''Multilateralism-Diplomatic and Otherwise''. *International Organization* 12 (1)”: 43-52.

Commission on Global Security, Justice & Governance. 2015. ''Confronting the crisis of Global Governance: report of the Commission on Global Security, Justice & Governance''. The Hague: The Hague Institute for Global Justice and the Stimson Center. Accessed June 17, 2019.

Cox, Robert. 1983. ''Gramsci, Hegemony and International Relations: An essay in Method''. *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 12 (2): 162-175.

Cox, Robert. 1974. ''Leadership in Perspective: A Comment''. *International Organization* 28 (1): 141-144.

Cox, Robert. 1977. ''Labor and Hegemony''. *International Organization* 31 (3): 385-424.

Cox, Robert W. 1981. ''Social Forces, States and World Orders: Beyond International Relations Theory''. *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 10)2): 126-155.

Cox, Robert W. 1999. ''Civil society at the turn of the millennium: prospects for an alternative world order''. *Review of International Studies* 25 (3): 3-28.

D'Attoma, John William. 2011. ''Hegemony or Dominance? A Gramscian Analysis of US Ascendancy''. *Critique: a worldwide journal of politics*: 1-15.

EastWest Insittute. 2014. ''Global Cooperation in Cyberspace: Report from the World Cyberspace Cooperation Summit IV''. Silicon Valley 2013. Accessed July 4th, 2019. https://www.eastwest.ngo/sites/default/files/ideas-files/sv2013.pdf, and http://cybersummit.info/

Fliegauf, Mark. 2016. ''In Cyber (Governance) We Trust''. *Global Policy* 7 (1): 79-82.

Fritsch, Stefan. 2008. ''The UN Global Compact and the Global Governance of Corporate Social Responsibility: Complex Multilateralism for a More Human Globalisation?''. *Global Society* 22 (1): 1-26.

Geneva Internet Platform. ''Engaging digital actors, fostering effective digital policies and monitoring digital governance''. Diplomacy.edu. https://www.diplomacy.edu/capacity/GIP (accessed July 4, 2019)

Gramsci, Antonio. 1971. ''Selections from the prison notebooks of Antonio Gramsci''. Translated by Quintin Hoare and Geoffrey Nowell-Smith. London: Lawrence and Wishart.

Hawley, James P. 1980. ''Antonio Gramsci's Marxism: Class, State and Work''. *Social Problems* 27 (5): 584- 600.

Heickerö, Roland. 2013. "The dark sides of the internet: On cyber Threats and Information Warfare''. Peter Lang Publications, Stockholm.

Henderson, Christian. 2015. ''The United Nations and the regulation of cyber-security''. Book chapter in Research Handbook in International law series, Edward Elgar Publishing: 465-490.

Henriksen, Anders. 2019. ''The end of the road for the UN GGE process: The future regulation of cyberspace''. Journal of Cybersecurity 5 (1): 1-9.

Iasiello, Emilio. 2016. ''What happens if Cyber Norms are Agreed to''. *Georgetown Journal of International Affairs* 17: 30 -37.

Jayawardane, Sash, Joris Larik and Erin Jackson. 2015. ''Cyber Governance: Challenges, Solutions and Lessons for Effective Global Governance''. The Hague Institute for Global Justice, Policy Brief 17: 3- 19

Jenks, Bruce. 2014. ''Financing the UN development system and the future of multilateralism''. *Third World Quarterly* 35 (10):1809-1828.

Kahler, Miles. 1992. ''Multilateralism with Small and Large Numbers''. *International Organization* 46 (3): 681-708.

Kane, Angela. 2014. ''The Rocky Road to Consensus: The Work of UN Groups of Governmental Experts in the Field of ICTs and in the Context of International Security, 1998-2013. *American Foreign Policy Interests* 36: 314-321.

Katz, Hagai. 2006. ''Gramsci, Hegemony, and Global Civil Society Networks''. *Voluntas* 17: 333-348.

Keohane, Robert O. 1990. "Multilateralism: An Agenda for Research". *International Journal* 45 (4): 731-764.

Kaspersky Lab Report. 2014. ''Financial cyber threats in 2013'': 1-35.

Kosenkov, Alexander. 2016. ''Cyber Conflicts as a New Global Threat''. *Future Internet* (8) 45: 1-9.

Krause, Joachim. 2004. ''Multilateralism: Behind European views''. *Washington Quarterly* 27 (2):43-59.

Kuziemko, Ilyana and Eric Werker. 2006. ''How Much Is a Seat on the Security Council Worth? Foreign Aid and Bribary at the United Nations''. *Journal of Political Economy* 114 (5): 905-930.

Lee, Luke T. 1987. ''Toward a World Without Refugees: The United Nations Group of Governmental Experts on International Co-operation to Avert New Flows of Refugees''. British Yearbook of International Law 57 (1): 317-336.

Lewis, James and Kerstin Vignard. 2016. ''Report of the International Security Cyber Issues Workshop Series''. United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research (UNIDIR) and the Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS): 1- 21.

Laing, Brian. 2017. ''Cyber global warming: six steps towards meltdown''. *Network Security:* 11-13.

Meyer, Paul. 2013. ''Cyber security takes the floor at the UN''. Opencanada.org. Accessed July 4, 2019. https://www.opencanada.org/features/cyber-security-takes-the-floor-at-the-un/.

Mazanec, Brian. 2016. ''Constraining Norms for Cyber Warfare Are Unlikely''. *Georgetown Journal of International Affairs* 17: 100- 109.

McKay, Angela, Paul Nicholas, Jan Neutze and Kevin Sullivan. 2014. ''International Cybersecurity Norms: Reducing conflict in and Internet-dependent world''. Microsoft: 2-20. Accessed June 18, 2019. file:///C:/Users/Gebruiker Laptop/Downloads/International_Cybersecurity_%20Norms.pdf.

Mihr, Anja. 2014. ''Good Cyber Governance: The Human Rights and Multi-Stakeholder Approach''. *Georgetown Journal of International Affairs* 15: 24- 34.

Moolakkattu, John S. 2009. ''Robert W. Cox and Critical Theory of International Relations''. *International Studies* 46 (4): 439- 456.

Norton by Symantec. 2017. ''Norton Cyber Security Insights Reports Global Results'': 1-30. Accessed 4th of June 2019. https://now.symassets.com/content/dam/norton/global/pdfs/norton_cybersecurity_insights/NCSIR-global-results-US.pdf.

Paris, Roland. 1997. ''Peacebuilding and the Limits of Liberal Internationalism''. *International Security* 22 (2): 54-89.

Park, Min Joung and Hannah Jun. 2016. ''New Perspectives on Transnational Public-Private Partnerships: A Critical Analysis of the United Nations-Business Partnership''. *Asian International Studies Review* 17 (1): 37-54.

Ratnet, Steven R. 1999. ''United Nations Group of Experts for Cambodia''. *The American Journal of International Law* 93 (4): 948-953.

Ruggie, John Gerard. 1992. ''Multilateralism: The Anatomy of an Institution''. *International Organization* 46 (3): 561-598

Schäferhöff, Marco, Sabine Campe and Christopher Kaan. 2009. ''Transnational Public-Private Partnerships in International Relations: Making Sense of Concepts, Research Frameworks, and Results''. *International Studies Review* 11: 451-474.

Shackleford, Scott J, Enrique Oti, Jaclyn A, Kerr, Elaine Korzak and Andreas Kuehn. 2015. ''Global Governance: Back to the Future of Internet Governance?''. *Georgetown Journal of International Affairs* 16: 83-97.

Shuval, Hillel I. 1975. ''Report on United Nations expert group meting on the achievement of efficiency in the use and reuse of water in cooperation with the government of Israel''. *Water Research* 9, Pergamon Press: 465.

Simpson, Seamus. 2004. ''Explaining the Commercialization of the Internet''. *Communication & Society* 7 (1): 50-68.

Slaughter, Anne-Marie. 1994. ''The Liberal Agenda for Peace: International relations Theory and the Future of the United nations''. *Transnational Law & Contemporary Problems* 4: 377-419.

Sperber, Nathan and George Hoare. 2016. ''An introduction to Antonio Gramsci: his life, thought and legacy''. Bloomsbury publishing, London.

Swift, Richard N. 1958. ''United States Leadership in the United Nations''. *The Western Political Quarterly* 11 (2)''183-194.

Tikk-Ringas, Eneken. 2016. ''International Cyber Norms Dialogue as an Exercise of Normative Power''. *Georgetown International Affairs* 17: 47-59.

Geneva Internet Platform. ''UN GGE and OEWG''. Dig.watch.com. https://dig.watch/processes/un-gge (accessed March 10, 2019).

UN GGE. 2010. ''Report of the Group of Governmental Experts on Developments in the Field of Information and Telecommunications in the Context of International Security''. United Nations General Assembly. A/65/201: 2-11.

UN GGE. 2013. ''Report of the Group of Governmental Experts on Developments in the Field of Information and Telecommunication in the Context of International Security''. United Nations General Assembly. A/68/98: 1- 13.

UN GGE. 2015. ''Report of the Group of Governmental Experts on Developments in the Field of Information and telecommunication in the Context of International Security''. United Nations General Assembly. A/70/174: 2- 17.

Ulfgard, Rebecka Villanueva and Antonio Alejo Jaime. 2014. ''New multilateralism and governmental mechanisms for including civil society during Mexico's presidency of the G20 in 2012. *Third World Quarterly* 35 (8): 1529-1546.

Utting, Peter. 2000. ''UN-Business Partnerships: Whose Agenda Counts?''. Presented at seminar on Partnerships for Development or Privatization of the Multilateral System? Oslo.

Utting, Peter and Ann Zammit. 2009. ''United Nations-Business Partnerships: Good Intentions and Contradictory Agendas''. *Journal of Business Ethics* 90: 39-56.

United Nations Global Compact. ''Our Participants'', in the United Nations Global Compact Database. UNglobalcompact.org. https://www.unglobalcompact.org/what-is-gc/participants/search?utf8=%E2%9C%93&search%5Bkeywords%5D=ICT&button=&search%5Bper_page%5D=10&search%5Bsort_field%5D=&search%5Bsort_direction%5D=asc (accessed June 1, 2019.

UNODA (United Nations Office for Disarmament and Affairs. 2014. Fact Sheet ''Developments in the field of information and telecommunications in the context of international security''. Accessed May 1st, 2019. https://s3.amazonaws.com/unoda-web/wp-content/uploads/2018/07/Information-Security-Fact-Sheet-July2018.pdf.

Van Der Meer, Sico. 2015. ''Enhancing International Cyber Security: A Key Role for Diplomacy''. *Security and Human Rights* 26: 193-205.

Van Horenbeeck, Maarten. 2018. ''The Future of Internet governance and cyber-security''. *Computer Fraud & Security*: 6-8.

Woo, Byungwon and Eunbin Chung. 2018. ''Aid for Vote? United Nations General Assembly Voting and American Aid Allocation''. *Political Studies* 66 (4): 1002-1026.

Xun, Pang and Wang Shuai. 2018. ''The International Political Significance of Chinese and US Foreign Aid: As Seen in United Nations General Assembly Voting''. *Social Sciences in China* 39 (1): 5-33.

Appendix

1.1 Three stages for socio economic groups to achieve hegemony in industrial societies according to Gramscian theory (Cafruny 2016 p. 76-66)

Stage 1: Self awareness	Stage 2: Formation of the ''Historical bloc''	Stage 3: Consolidate durable power
Group should be conscious of its interests and ideal aspirations, including the aspiration to become hegemonic.	Group must build contagious alliances with other socio-economic groups, overcoming narrow economic-corporate interests with the aim to join forces with other groups and engage in political struggles.	Group must consolidate its hegemonic power and be sure that it is stable and long-lasting, consists of ensuring economic growth and prosperity.

1.2 ''Developments in the Field of Information and Telecommunications in the Context of International Security'' (UNODA Fact Sheet 2019).

Period	Mechanism	Resolution	Meetings	Report	Comments
2004/2005	GGE – 15 members	A/RES/58/32	2 in NY, 2 in Geneva	A/60/202	No consensus
2009/2010	GGE – 15 members	A/RES/60/45	2 in NY, 2 in Geneva	A/65/201	
2012/2013	GGE – 15 members	A/RES/66/24	2 in NY, 2 in Geneva	A/68/98	
2014/2015	GGE – 20 members	A/RES/68/243	2 in NY, 2 in Geneva	A/70/174	
2016/2017	GGE – 25 members	A/RES/70/237	2 in NY, 2 in Geneva	A/72/327	No consensus
2019-2020	OEWG – all member states	A/RES/73/27	4 in NY;		

2019-2021	GGE – 25 members	A/RES/73/266	2 in NY, 2 in Geneva		

1.3 ''Reports of the UN GGE''. https://dig.watch/processes/ungge. Accessed 2019.

2010 UN GGE report	2013 UN GGE report	2015 UN GGE report
Further dialogue among States to reduce the risk and protect critical national and international infrastructure	Recognition that international law, and in particular the UN Charter, applies to digital space	Norms, rules, and principles on the responsible behaviour of States
Confidence-building, stability and risk reduction measures	Norms, Rules, and principles on the responsible behaviour of States	Confidence-building measures
Information exchanges on national legislation and strategies, and capacity-building measures	Reference that state sovereignty applies to the digital field	International cooperation and assistance in ICT security and capacity building
The elaboration of common terms and definitions related to information security	The principle that states must meet their international obligations regarding internationally wrongful acts in cyberspace attributable to them	How international law applies to the use of ICT's

1.4 Some major international cyber-attacks targeting states 2010-2015. Center for strategic and International Studies. https://www.csis.org/programs/technology-policy-program/significant-cyber-incidents. Accessed 2019.

Year	Target country	Cyber attack
2007	Estonia	Russian cyber-attacks on Estonian infrastructure, closure governmental and

		banking system
2009	South Korea and United States	Cyberattacks on websites, including governmental websites
2010	Burma	Cyberattacks associated with the national elections in Myanmar in 2010
2010	Japan- South Korea cyberwarfare	
2013	Singapore	
2016	United States	Democratic National Committee cyber attacks